



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,771	01/23/2002	John A. Schillinger	N1206-373	7104

73905 7590 09/24/2007

MONSANTO
C/O SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. BOX 061080
SOUTH WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

PARA, ANNETTE H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1661

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/24/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/052,771

Applicant(s)

SCHILLINGER ET AL.

Examiner

Annette H. Para

Art Unit

1661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,25,33,35,39,42 and 43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25,33,35,39,42 and 43 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07232007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35 USC not included in this Action can be found in the previous Office Action sent on 12/1/2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, and 4-10, remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhodes (U.S. Patent No. 5,710,368) in view of Russell et al. (EPO 0430511A1) and in view of Botterman et al. (Herbic. Resist. Weeds Crops 1991).

Applicant argues that Rhodes cannot be used as Prior Art because being owned by Asgrow Seed Company as the present case (p. 4 of applicant's response).

This is not found persuasive because Applicant does not show that the common ownership exists at the time the present invention was made. Applicant fails to provide a statement that the present application and Rhodes reference were owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to Asgrow Seed Company at the time the invention was made in a conspicuous manner, and therefore is not disqualified as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Applicant must file the required evidence in order to properly disqualify the Rhodes' reference under 35 U.S.C. 103(c). See MPEP § 706.02(I). In addition, applicant may overcome the applied art either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that the invention disclosed therein was derived from the inventor of this application, and is therefore not the invention "by another", or by antedating the applied art under 37 CFR 1.131. The Examiner notes that the instant application contains no inventor(s) in common with the '368 patent.

Applicant argues that because the Restriction Requirement states that "the invention of Groups I-XXVI are each capable of being separately made, independently used and the patentability of one would not render the other obvious or unpatentable, therefore the currently invention is not rendered obvious or unpatentable by any plants and seeds that are resistant to at least two herbicides or soybean plants and seeds resistant to at least two herbicides or soybean plants and seeds resistant to ALS inhibitor and glufosinate herbicides. Therefore the Office cannot now assert the opposite (pp.5-6 Applicant's response).

This is not found persuasive because a restriction requirement is not an admission by the Office of patentability.

Furthermore, Applicant argues that Botterman et al. do not teach transgenic glufosinate-tolerant soybean plants but teach other species such as tobacco, sugar beet and alfalfa resistant to glufosinate. Applicant then argues that because of the absence of field tests conducted on soybean with glufosinate resistance, the result from producing the soybean plant with this trait is speculative and unpredictable. (p. 6 Applicant's response)

Examiner admits to an error in the facts and extends her apologies; still, the Applicant's argument is not found persuasive because Botterman et al. teach a soybean plant resistant to Glyphosate tested in field trials (p.358 paragraph 5). Botterman et al also teach field trials with glufosinate resistant tobacco, sugar beet, tomato, potato, poplar and alfalfa. In most cases herbicide resistance was observed and no yield penalties were observed (p. 358-359). Furthermore, Russell et al. teach a soybean plant resistant to glutamine synthetase inhibitors using the Bar gene method as Botterman et al.(whole document). Every limitation of claims 1,2 and 4-10 are taught in the prior arts and at the time of the present invention it would have been obvious to combine the teaching of the prior arts for the reason stated in the previous office action mailed on January 19, 2007.

Finally, Applicant argue that one skill in the art would not have reasonably predicted as of the filing date that a plant could be obtained comprising transgenes conferring tolerance to glyphosate and glufosinate and also having commercially significant yield. Applicant cites Byrum's declaration, which states that no soybean variety was ever developed prior to the invention having more than one herbicide resistance transgene combine in a single soybean plant.

This is not found persuasive because Botterman et al. teach plants resistant to glufosinate, the trait being inherited as a dominant Mendelian trait. Knowing that it would have been obvious to cross a transgenic soybean plant resistant to both Glyphosate and Glufosinate with one with a high yield production trait as taught by Rhodes. Rhodes teaches soybean seeds and plants that have resistance to glyphosate (Roundup™) and contain the Als gene for sulfonylurea tolerance (column 2, lines 20-22). Hence, at the time of the present invention a soybean plant variety had been developed having more than one herbicide resistance transgene combine in a single soybean plant.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Future Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Annette H Para whose telephone number is (571) 272-0982. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 5:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Anne Marie Grunberg, can be reached on (571) 272-0975. The fax number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> . Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DAVID H. KRUSE, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Annette H Para